arXiv:math/0509450v1 [math.OA] 20 Sep 2005

ON SIMPLICITY OF REDUCED C*-ALGEBRAS OF GROUPS

Pierre de la Harpe

Abstract. A countable group is C*-simple if its reeduced C*-algebra is a simple algebra. Since Powers recognised in 1975 that non-abelian free groups are C*-simple, large classes of groups which appear naturally in geometry have been identified, including non-elementary Gromov hyperbolic groups and lattices in semisimple groups.

In this exposition, C*-simplicity for countable groups is shown to be an extreme case of non-amenability. The basic examples are described and several open problems are formulated.

1. Introduction, and a first definition of "C*-simple groups".
2. Formulation in terms of C*-algebras.
3. Powers result on non-abelian free groups.
4. Other examples of C*-simple groups.
Appendix.
I. On the definition of weak containment (Definition 1).
II. On weak equivalence not preserving irreducibility.
III. On diagonal and arbitrary matrix coefficients.
IV. On a definition of Zimmer.
V. Other notions of equivalence.
VI. The dual of a group.
VII. Groups of Type I.
VIII. The reduced dual.
IX. The Dixmier property.
X. On the icc condition.

1. Introduction, and a first definition of "C*-simple groups"

The subject of this exposition is that of unitary group representations in Hilbert spaces and related C*-algebras. It is an updated version of notes for a lecture presented at Bar-Ilan and Jerusalem in June 2000.

Let G be a topological group. A *unitary representation* of G in a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ is a homomorphism $\rho : G \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H})$ in the unitary group of $\mathcal{H}$; it is part of the definition that the companion mapping $G \times \mathcal{H} \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is continuous. Recall that $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H})$ is the group of all linear operators $u : \mathcal{H} \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}$ which are unitary, namely isometric ($\|u(\xi)\| = \|\xi\|$ for all $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$) and onto.

There are two unitary representations which play a leading part. The first is the *unit representation* 1_G, for which $\mathcal{H}$ is the complex field, defined by $1_G(g) = \mathrm{id}$ for all $g \in G$. The second is the *left-regular representation* λ_G, which is defined only when the group G is *locally compact* (which is by far the most important case); it acts on the Hilbert space

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 22D25, 46L05.

Key words and phrases. Unitary representations, weak containment, reduced C*-algebras, simplicity.

Part of this report is on work joint with M. Bekka, for which support from the Swiss National Science Foundation is gratefully acknowledged.

$L^2(G)$ of complex-valued measurable functions ξ on G which are square-integrable with respect to a left-invariant Haar measure (functions modulo equality almost everywhere), and it is defined by $(\lambda_G(g)\xi)(g') = \xi(g^{-1}g')$ for all $g, g' \in G$.

The notions of unitary equivalence and of subrepresentations are well suited for comparing unitary representations of compact groups. Other groups require weaker and less rigid notions, defined in terms of coefficients. For a representation $\rho : G \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H})$ as above, we associate to each vector $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$ the corresponding *diagonal matrix coefficient*

$$\varphi_{\xi,\xi} : \begin{cases} G & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{C} \\ g & \longmapsto & \langle \xi \mid \rho(g)\xi \rangle \end{cases}$$

which is a concrete embodiment, namely a continuous complex-valued function, of more abstract data, namely of the representation.

1. Definition. *Given two unitary representations ρ, σ of the same group G, say that ρ is* weakly contained *in σ, and write $\rho \prec \sigma$, if any diagonal matrix coefficient of ρ is a limit of sums of diagonal matrix coefficients of σ, uniformly on compact subsets of G. Two unitary representations are* weakly equivalent, *written $\rho \sim \sigma$, if each one is weakly contained in the other.*

A straightforward example is that of a subrepresentation ρ of a representation σ : it is then obvious that $\rho \prec \sigma$. But the converse does not hold; indeed, it is easy to check[1] that the one-dimensional representation $1_{\mathbf{R}}$ of $\mathbf{R}$ is weakly contained in the regular representation $\lambda_{\mathbf{R}}$, and that $1_{\mathbf{R}}$ is not a subrepresentation of $\lambda_{\mathbf{R}}$. In the particular case of two finite-dimensional representations ρ and σ, we have $\rho \prec \sigma$ if and only if ρ is a subrepresentation of $N\sigma$ (in the naive sense), where $N\sigma$ stands for a direct sum of N copies of σ, and where the integer N is large enough; if ρ is moreover irreducible, then $\rho \prec \sigma$ if and only if ρ is a subrepresentation of σ.

See Parts I to III of the appendix for more comments, and Part IV for a slightly different notion. See Part V for *other* notions of equivalence.

We define now "C*-simple groups" in terms of the notions introduced so far. The reformulation of the next section (Corollary 8) will justify the terminology and allow us to sketch a general setting. Also, we recall one of the many standard equivalent definitions of "amenable groups".

2. Definition. *A topological group G is* amenable *if $1_G \prec \lambda_G$, and* C*-simple *if, for any unitary representation ρ of G, the conditions $\rho \prec \lambda_G$ and $\rho \sim \lambda_G$ are equivalent.*

On the one hand, standard examples of amenable groups include soluble groups, locally finite groups, and finitely-generated groups of subexponential growth; for other examples, see [CeGH–99], [GrZu–02], and [BaVi]. If G is amenable, it is a fact that *any* unitary

[1] Diagonal matrix coefficients of $1_{\mathbf{R}}$ are constant functions. For $n \geq 1$, define a unit vector $\xi_n \in L^2(\mathbf{R})$ by $\xi_n(t) = 1/\sqrt{2n}$ if $|t| \leq n$ and $\xi_n(t) = 0$ if $|t| > n$; for any constant $c > 0$, we have $\lim_{n\to\infty} \left(\sup_{|s|\leq c} |1 - \langle \xi_n \mid \lambda_{\mathbf{R}}(s)\xi_n \rangle| \right) = 0$, and it follows that $1_{\mathbf{R}} \prec \lambda_{\mathbf{R}}$. On the other hand, $1_{\mathbf{R}}$ is not a subrepresentation of $\lambda_{\mathbf{R}}$ since the only constant function in $L^2(\mathbf{R})$ is zero. For any locally compact group G which is not compact, the same argument shows that $1_G \prec \lambda_G$ and that 1_G is not a subrepresentation of λ_G.

representation of G is weakly contained in the left-regular representation λ_G (Proposition 18.3.6 in [DC*–69]). On the other hand, C*-simple groups include

- non-abelian free groups [Pow–75],
- non-trivial free products [PaSa–79],
- non-soluble subgroups of $PSL_2(\mathbf{R})$ [Har–85],
- torsion-free non-elementary Gromov-hyperbolic groups [Har–88],
- $PSL_n(\mathbf{Z})$ for $n \geq 2$ [BCH1–94], and more generally any Zariski-dense subgroup with centre reduced to $\{1\}$ in a connected semi-simple real Lie group without compact factor [BCH2–94],
- centerless mapping class groups and outer automorphism groups of free groups [BrHa–04],
- irreducible Coxeter groups which are neither finite nor affine (see [Fen–03] and our Corollary 18),

as we will discuss below.

Observe that a group G not reduced to one element cannot be both amenable and C*-simple. Indeed, this would imply $\lambda_G \prec 1_G$; but any coefficient of 1_G is a constant function on G, whereas a diagonal matrix coefficient $\varphi_{\xi,\xi} : g \longmapsto \langle \xi \mid \lambda_G(g)\xi \rangle$, for an appropriate function $\xi \in L^2(G)$ supported in a small neighbourhood $\mathcal{V}$ of the identity, has value 1 at $g = 1$ and 0 at g in the complement of $\mathcal{V}$; thus $\varphi_{\xi,\xi}$ is not a limit of constant functions, so that $\lambda_G \not\prec 1_G$.

Together with a basic result on unitary induction of representations, the same argument is used to show the following generalization.

3. Proposition. *Let G be a second-countable[2] locally compact group which contains an amenable closed normal subgroup $N \neq \{1\}$. Then G is not C*-simple.*

Proof. We formulate the proof for a group Γ which is discrete and countable. The general case is similar, modulo a standard (but technical) result on the existence of quasi-invariant measures on homogeneous spaces of G.

Consider the *quasi-regular representation* $\lambda_{\Gamma/N}$ of Γ in $\ell^2(\Gamma/N)$, defined by

$$\big(\lambda_{\Gamma/N}(\gamma)\xi\big)\,(\gamma' N) = \xi(\gamma^{-1}\gamma' N) \qquad \text{for all} \qquad \gamma \in \Gamma, \quad \xi \in \ell^2(\Gamma/N), \quad \gamma' N \in \Gamma/N;$$

it coincides with the so-called *induced representation* $\mathrm{Ind}_N^\Gamma(1_N)$ of 1_N from N to Γ. Observe that any diagonal coefficient of $\lambda_{\Gamma/N}$ is constant on N; indeed, for $\xi \in \ell^2(\Gamma/N)$ and $\gamma \in N$, we have $\big(\lambda_{\Gamma/N}(\gamma)\xi\big)(xN) = \xi(\gamma^{-1}xN) = \xi(xN)$ for all $x \in \Gamma$, namely $\lambda_{\Gamma/N}(\gamma)\xi = \xi$.

On the contrary, diagonal matrix coefficients of λ_Γ separate the points of Γ. Indeed, let $a \in \Gamma$; set $\xi = 2^{-1/2}(\delta_1 + i\delta_a)$; then $\langle \xi \mid \lambda_\Gamma(a)\xi \rangle = 1$ when $a = 1$ and $\langle \xi \mid \lambda_\Gamma(a)\xi \rangle \neq 1$ when $a \neq 1$.

We have $1_N \prec \lambda_N$ by hypothesis. As weak containment is stable by induction (a result of Fell [Fel–64]), we have also

$$\mathrm{Ind}_N^\Gamma(1_N) = \lambda_{\Gamma/N} \;\prec\; \lambda_\Gamma = \mathrm{Ind}_N^\Gamma(\lambda_N).$$

If Γ was C*-simple, we would have $\lambda_\Gamma \prec \lambda_{\Gamma/N}$; but this is impossible since we have just checked that any diagonal coefficient of $\lambda_{\Gamma/N}$ is constant on N, whereas this does not hold for λ_Γ. □

[2]To avoid technical problems, we will assume whenever useful that locally compact groups appearing here are *second countable.* Accordingly, "discrete groups", denoted by Γ, are assumed to be *countable.*

Reformulation. In any locally compact group G, there exists a unique maximal amenable normal subgroup which is called the *amenable radical*. The notion is due to Day (see Lemma 1 in § 4 of [Day–57]), and a good reference is Proposition 4.1.12 in [Zim–84]. Thus Proposition 3 can be reformulated as follows: *If G is a second-countable locally compact group with amenable radical not reduced to one element, then G is not C*-simple.*

4. Question. *Does there exist a countable group Γ with amenable radical reduced to one element such that Γ is not C*-simple?*

Question 4 is discussed in [BeHa–00].

A non-trivial connected group is never C*-simple; see Proposition 4 of [BCH1–94], which is a consequence of Proposition 3 above and of the structure of connected locally compact groups. This explains why, in this exposition,

all positive results on C-simple groups are about countable groups.*

It is however natural to formulate the following open problem.

5. Question. *Do there exist non-discrete second countable locally compact groups which are C*-simple?*

With Proposition 3, representation theory shows two opposite classes of locally compact groups, namely amenable groups and C*-simple groups. Let us recall here that the point of view of representations provides another and even more fundamental tame-versus-chaotic dichotomy between so-called *groups of type I* and other groups (it is important here that locally compact groups are *second-countable*). See Part VI of the appendix for the relevant theorem, essentially due Glimm, and Part VII for groups of "type Γ".

If G is of type I, the set of its irreducible unitary representations has a Borel structure which is countably separated, and its representations can be analyzed as "direct integrals" of irreducible representations in a useful way. Two irreducible representations of such a G are weakly equivalent if and only they are unitarily equivalent. Groups of type I include compact groups, abelian groups, connected real Lie groups which are either semi-simple or nilpotent, and many others (more on this in the Appendix).

On the contrary, for *any group which is not of type I,* there is no reasonable description[3] of all irreducible unitary representation; moreover, there is no kind of unicity in the decomposition of a unitary representations in irreducible representations. Groups not of type I include all countable groups which are not virtually abelian and some soluble connected real Lie groups (there are examples in § 19 of [Kir–74]).

2. Formulation in terms of C*-algebras

Let Γ be a group. To any unitary representation $\rho : \Gamma \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H})$, we associate the C*-algebra

$$C^*_\rho(\Gamma) \;=\; \text{norm closure of linear span of } \; \big(\rho(\gamma)\big)_{\gamma\in\,\Gamma}$$

which is a sub-C*-algebra of the algebra of all bounded operators on $\mathcal{H}$. More generally, for a unitary representation ρ of a second countable locally compact group G, we define

$$C^*_\rho(G) \;=\; \text{norm closure of linear span of } \; \int_G \rho(g)f(g)dg \;\text{ for }\; f\in\mathcal{K}(G)$$

[3]The statement on "no reasonable description" may be unfair in the case of nilpotent groups; see for instance [Kir–04] and [BaKM–97].

where $\mathcal{K}(G)$ denotes the convolution algebra of complex-valued continuous functions with compact supports on G, and where dg denotes a left-invariant Haar measure on G.

In the trivial case where ρ is one-dimensional, we find $C^*_\rho(G) \approx \mathbf{C}$. In case ρ is irreducible and finite dimensional, say of dimension n, we have $C^*_\rho(G) \approx Mat_n(\mathbf{C})$ by a theorem of Burnside. (See e.g. § 6 in [Ser–67], or § XVII.3 in [Lan–65], at least for the case of a finite group.) Besides these "small" examples, the two most important cases appear in the next definition. Recall that the *universal representation* π_{uni} of a group G is the direct sum of all (equivalence classes of) unitary representations of G in appropriate Hilbert spaces[4].

6. Definition. *The* maximal C*-algebra $C^*_{max}(G)$ *of* G *is the C*-algebra corresponding to the* universal representation π_{uni} *of* G. *The* reduced C*-algebra $C^*_{red}(G)$ *of* G *is the C*-algebra corresponding to the left-regular representation of* G.

The maximal C*-algebra has some properties of the "complex group algebra" in algebra[5] . In particular, any unitary representation $\rho : G \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}_\rho)$ determines naturally a morphism of C*-algebras $C^*_{max}(G) \longrightarrow C^*_\rho(G)$, again denoted by ρ, with kernel denoted by $C^*Ker(\rho)$. We will see below that the reduced C*-algebra is very far from being functorial, since many residually finite groups[6] have simple reduced C*-algebras.

The following is standard. See Theorem 1.3 in [Fel–60], or Theorem 3.4.4 and Proposition 18.1.4 in [DC*–69].

7. Theorem. *Let* G *be a second countable locally compact group and let* ρ, σ *be two unitary representations of* G. *Then the following properties are equivalent.*

(*i*) $C^*Ker(\sigma) \subset C^*Ker(\rho)$,
(*ii*) $\|\rho(x)\| \leq \|\sigma(x)\|$ *for all* $x \in C^*_{max}(G)$,
(*iii*) $\rho \prec \sigma$.

On the proof. If (*i*) holds, the morphism of C*-algebras

$$\begin{cases} C^*_\sigma(G) \,=\, C^*_{max}(G)/C^*Ker(\sigma) \;\longrightarrow\; C^*_{max}(G)/C^*Ker(\rho) \,=\, C^*_\rho(G) \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \sigma(x) \;\longmapsto\; \rho(x) \end{cases}$$

is well defined. As morphisms of C*-algebras are contractions, (*ii*) follows. Conversely, it is obvious that (*ii*) implies (*i*).

The proof of the equivalence of (*i*) and (*ii*) with (*iii*) requires some prerequisite. Recall that a function $\varphi : G \longrightarrow \mathbf{C}$ is of *positive type* if $\sum_{1\leq j,k\leq n} \varphi\left(g_j^{-1}g_k\right)\overline{\lambda_j}\lambda_k \,\geq\, 0$

[4]Some bound should be given on the dimensions of these spaces, so that the sum is over a well-defined set.

[5]In the case of "discrete groups", it is also functorial in the following sense : any group homomorphism $\Gamma_1 \longrightarrow \Gamma_2$ "extends" naturally to a morphism of C*-algebras $C^*_{max}(\Gamma_1) \longrightarrow C^*_{max}(\Gamma_2)$, and the C*-morphism is injective if the group morphism is injective (Proposition 1.2 of [Rie–74]). This does *not* carry over to locally compact groups ! For example, $C^*_{max}(PSL_2(\mathbf{Z}))$, a C*-algebra with unit, does not embedd in $C^*_{max}(PSL_2(\mathbf{R}))$, which has none. For a lattice Γ in a Lie group G, the natural morphism from $C^*_{max}(\Gamma)$ has for its range the *multiplier algebra* $M(C^*_{max}(G))$; but, whatever functor could be defined here, it will be such that this morphism $C^*_{max}(\Gamma) \longrightarrow M(C^*_{max}(G))$ needs not be injective [BeVa–95].

[6]A group Γ is *residually finite* if, for every $\gamma \in \Gamma$, $\gamma \neq 1$, there exists a finite group Q and a homomorphism $\phi : \Gamma \longrightarrow Q$ such that $\phi(\gamma) \neq 1$; or, equivalently, if the intersection of the normal subgroups of finite index in Γ is reduced to $\{1\}$.

for all $g_1, \ldots, g_n \in G$ and $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n \in \mathbf{C}$. If ρ is a unitary representation of G, it is straightforward that, for any vector ξ in the representation space of ρ, the function $\varphi_\xi^\rho : g \longmapsto \langle \xi \mid \rho(g)\xi \rangle$ is of positive type. It is a fact that any function of positive type φ on G extends to a positive linear form on $C^*_{max}(G)$; if $\varphi = \varphi_\xi^\rho$ is associated to ρ, this linear form vanishes on $C^*Ker(\rho)$, and defines consequently a positive linear form on $C^*_\rho(G)$. Moreover, a sequence $(\varphi_i)_{i\geq 1}$ of functions of positive type on G converges uniformly on compact subsets of G if and only if the corresponding sequence of bounded linear forms converges in the weak-$*$ topology on the appropriate C*-algebra. For all this, see Sections 2.7, 13.4, 13.5, and 18.1 in [DC*–69].

We can now sketch a proof that the negation of (iii) implies the negation of (i). If $\rho \not\prec \sigma$, there exist some positive linear form $\varphi_\xi^\rho : C^*_{\max}(G) \longrightarrow \mathbf{C}$ which is *not* in the weak-$*$-closure of the convex hull of the positive linear forms φ_η^σ associated to σ. It is then a consequence of the Hahn-Banach theorem that there exists $x \in C^*_{\max}(G)$ such that $\langle \eta \mid \sigma(x)\eta \rangle = 0$ for all $\eta \in \mathcal{H}_\sigma$, and $\langle \xi \mid \rho(x)\xi \rangle \neq 0$ for some $\xi \in \mathcal{H}_\rho$. Hence[7] $\sigma(x) = 0$ and $\rho(x) \neq 0$, so that the negation of (i) holds.

To show that (iii) implies (ii), one can argue as follows; we assume for simplicity that $G = \Gamma$ is a countable group, namely that the C*-algebras which occur have units. For $\xi \in \mathcal{H}_\rho$, the positive linear form φ_ξ^ρ on $C^*_{max}(\Gamma)$ has a norm which is its value at 1 :

$$\left\| \varphi_\xi^\rho \right\| \, = \, \langle \xi \mid \rho(1)\xi \rangle \, = \, \|\xi\|^2 .$$

Suppose now that $\rho \prec \sigma$. For each compact subset Q of G and for each $\epsilon > 0$, there exist a finite sequence $\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_n$ of vectors in $\mathcal{H}_\sigma$ and a corresponding positive linear form

$$\psi_{Q,\epsilon}^\sigma \, : \, x \, \longmapsto \, \sum_{j=1}^N \langle \eta_j \mid \sigma(x)\eta_j \rangle$$

on $C^*_{max}(\Gamma)$, of norm $\psi_{Q,\epsilon}^\sigma(1) = \sum_{j=1}^N \|\eta_j\|^2$, such that the net $\left(\psi_{Q,\epsilon}^\sigma\right)_{Q,\epsilon}$ converges to φ_ξ^ρ in the weak*-topology. [The set of pairs (Q, ϵ) with Q compact in G and $\epsilon > 0$ is a net with respect to the order $(Q, \epsilon) \leq (Q', \epsilon')$ if $Q \subset Q'$ and $\epsilon \geq \epsilon'$.] Thus, for (Q, ϵ) in the net and $\psi_{Q,\epsilon}^\sigma(\cdot) = \sum_{j=1}^N \langle \eta_j \mid \sigma(\cdot)\eta_j \rangle$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \xi \mid \rho(x)\xi \rangle| \, &\leq \, \sum_{j=1}^N |\langle \eta_j \mid \sigma(x)\eta_j \rangle| \, + \, \epsilon \, \leq \, \|\sigma(x)\| \sum_{j=1}^N \|\eta_j\|^2 \, + \, \epsilon \\ &\leq \, \|\sigma(x)\| \, \|\xi\|^2 \, + \, 2\epsilon \end{aligned}$$

for all $x \in C^*_{max}(\Gamma)$. This shows that $|\langle \xi \mid \rho(x)\xi \rangle| \leq \|\sigma(x)\| \, \|\xi\|^2$, and thus also that $\|\rho(x)\| \leq \|\sigma(x)\|$, for all $x \in C^*_{max}(\Gamma)$. □

As a consequence, we can justify the terminology of Section 1.

[7] Recall that an operator y on a *complex* Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ is zero if and only if $\langle \xi \mid y\xi \rangle = 0$ for all $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$; see e.g. § 18 in [Hal–51]. This does *not* hold for real Hilbert spaces, as the matrix $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ demonstrates.

8. Corollary. *A second-countable locally compact group G is C*-simple if and only if its reduced C*-algebra is simple.*

Proof. Assume $C^*_{red}(G)$ is simple as an algebra. Then $C^*Ker(\lambda_G)$ is maximal as a two-sided ideal in $C^*_{max}(G)$, hence G is C*-simple in the sense of Definition 2.

Assume conversely that G is C*-simple as in Definition 2, so that $C^*Ker(\lambda_G)$ is maximal among ideals of the form $C^*Ker(\rho)$. Then $C^*Ker(\lambda_G)$ is maximal among all two-sided ideals of $C^*_{max}(G)$ by a general result on C*-algebras (Theorem 2.9.7.ii in [DC*–69]), and consequently $C^*_{red}(G)$ is a simple algebra. □

Note that the *maximal* C*-algebra of a group $G \neq 1$ cannot be simple since the unit representation 1_G provides a morphism from $C^*_{max}(G)$ onto $\mathbf{C}$.

Let G be a second-countable locally compact group. If G is amenable, *any* unitary representation of G is weakly contained in the regular one (as already stated after Proposition 2), so that the canonical morphism from $C^*_{max}(G)$ onto $C^*_{red}(G)$ is an isomorphism. In the particular case of an abelian group, $C^*_{red}(G)$ is also isomorphic to the algebra $\mathcal{C}_o(\hat{G})$ of continuous function which vanish at infinity on the dual $\hat{G}$ of G (Fourier transform and Pontrjagin duality); it follows that closed ideals of $C^*_{red}(G)$ are in a natural bijective correspondance with closed subspaces of $\hat{G}$.

It is a natural project to investigate in general the structure of closed ideals in $C^*_{max}(G)$ and $C^*_{red}(G)$. Let us indicate one motivation. Let A be a C*-algebra, let I be a closed two-sided ideal, and let A/I denote the quotient C*-algebra. Some problems concerning A split as simpler problems for I and A/I. For example, this is sometimes the case for the computation of K-groups, because there exists a cyclic six-term exact sequence connecting K_0 and K_1 of I, A, and A/I. Recall that the K-groups of algebras of the form $C^*_{red}(\Gamma)$ are crucial ingredients of the *Baum-Connes conjecture* [Val–02]. Thus a non-trivial closed two-sided ideal in $A = C^*_{red}(\Gamma)$ can suggests a strategy of computation of $K_*(A)$; in other words, from this point of view, the C*-simple groups provide "the hardest case".

Observe that Theorem 7 implies various numerical (in)equalities. For example, if S is a finite subset, say of size n, of a locally compact group G, and if ρ is a unitary representation of G which is weakly equivalent to λ_G, then

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{s \in S} \rho(s) \right\| = \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{s \in S} \lambda_G(s) \right\|.$$

See Item 20 below.

3. Powers result on non-abelian free groups

In 1975, Powers established that non-abelian free groups are C*-simple. Once conveniently reformulated, his method proved to be robust enough to apply to many more groups. The following terminology refers to the original paper [Pow–75].

9. Definition. *A group Γ has the* Powers property*, or is a* Powers groups*, if*

for any finite subset F in $\Gamma \setminus \{1\}$ and for any integer $N \geq 1$,
there exists a partition $\Gamma = C \sqcup D$ and elements $\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_N$ in Γ such that
$fC \cap C = \emptyset$ for all $f \in F$ and $\gamma_j D \cap \gamma_k D = \emptyset$ for all $j, k \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$, $j \neq k$.

10. Definitions. *A homeomorphism γ of a Hausdorff space L is* hyperbolic *if it has two fixed points $s_\gamma, r_\gamma \in L$ such that the following holds : for any neighbourhood S of s_γ and R of r_γ, there exists $n_0 \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\gamma^n(L \setminus S) \subset R$ and $\gamma^{-n}(L \setminus R) \subset S$ for all $n \geq n_0$. The points s_γ and r_γ are called the* source *and the* range *of γ, respectively.*

Two hyperbolic homeomorphisms of L are transverse *if they have no common fixed point.*

An action of a group Γ on L is strongly faithful *if, for any finite subset F of $\Gamma \setminus \{1\}$, there exists $y \in L$ such that $fy \neq y$ for all $f \in F$. It is* strongly hyperbolic *if, for any integer $N \geq 1$, there exist N pairwise transverse hyperbolic elements in Γ.*

In the definition of "strongly hyperbolic", observe that the condition for $N = 2$ implies the condition for any $N \geq 2$. Indeed, if h_1, h_2 are pairwise transverse hyperbolic homeomorphisms, then $h_1^{j_k} h_2 h_1^{-j_k}$ are pairwise transverse and hyperbolic for an appropriate sequence of integers $(j_k)_{k \geq 1}$ with $\lim_{k \to \infty} j_k = \infty$.

11. Proposition. *Let Γ be a group acting by homeomorphisms on a Hausdorff space L. Assume the action is*

(i) *minimal,*
(ii) *strongly faithful,*
(iii) *strongly hyperbolic.*

Then Γ is a Powers group.

Proof. Consider $F \subset \Gamma \setminus \{1\}$ and $N \geq 1$ as in the definition of "Powers group". By *(ii)* there exists a non-empty open subset C_L in L such that $fC_L \cap C_L = \emptyset$ for all $f \in F$. By *(iii)* there exist $N + 1$ pairwise transverse hyperbolic elements $\gamma = \gamma_0, \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n$ in Γ. By *(i)* we may assume $r_\gamma \in C_L$.

Upon conjugating $\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_N$ by a large enough power of γ, we may assume that, for each $j \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$, both the source s_j and the range r_j of γ_j are in C_L. We choose neighbourhoods S_j of s_j and R_j of r_j in such a way that $S_1, R_1, \ldots, S_N, R_N$ are pairwise disjoint and inside C_L. Upon replacing each of $\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_N$ by a large enough power of itself, we may furthermore assume that $\gamma_j(L \setminus C_L) \subset R_j$, and in particular that $\gamma_j(L \setminus C_L)$ are pairwise disjoint subsets of L.

Choose $y \in L$ and let $C = \{\gamma \in \Gamma \mid \gamma y \in C_L\}$ and $D = \{\gamma \in \Gamma \mid \gamma y \notin C_L\}$. Then $fC \cap C = \emptyset$, since $fC_L \cap C_L = \emptyset$, for all $f \in F$, and $\gamma_j D \cap \gamma_k D = \emptyset$, since $R_j \cap R_k = \emptyset$, for all $j \neq k$. □

Note. In [BrHa–04], Conditions (i) to (iii) have been changed as follows, so that minimality needs not to be assumed. Let L_{hyp} denote the subset of L of those points which are fixed by some hyperbolic element in Γ; this is a Γ-invariant subset of L. It is enough to assume:

(i) Γ contains two transverse hyperbolic homeomorphisms of L;
(ii) For any finite subset F of $\Gamma \setminus \{1\}$, there exists a point $t \in L_{\mathrm{hyp}}$ such that $ft \neq t$ for all $f \in F$.

12. Corollary. *The following are Powers groups:*

(i) *free products $\Gamma_1 * \Gamma_2$ with $(|\Gamma_1| - 1)(|\Gamma_2| - 1) \geq 2$;*
(ii) *non-soluble subgroups of $PSL_2(\mathbf{R})$;*
(iii) *torsion-free non-elementary Gromov-hyperbolic groups;*
(iv) *sufficiently large subgroups in mapping class groups of surfaces of genus $g \geq 1$;*

(v) *appropriate subgroups of the group of outer automorphisms of non abelian free groups.*

Observation. Non-abelian free groups are particular cases of each of the five classes in the corollary.

Proof. For a group in (i), the corollary follows from the proposition applied to the action of the group on the boundary of the tree associated to the free product as in [Ser–83]. For a group in (ii) [respectively in (iii)], the same argument applies to the action on its limit set in the boundary of the hyperbolic plane on which $PSL_2(\mathbf{R})$ acts by isometries [respectively on the Gromov boundary of the group].

For (iv), consider the mapping class group $\tilde{\Gamma}_g$ of an orientable closed surface of genus $g \geq 1$, viewed as acting on the boundary $P\mathcal{MF}_g$ of the corresponding Teichmüller space. For $g \leq 2$, the group $\tilde{\Gamma}_g$ has a centre Z_g of order 2 which acts on $P\mathcal{MF}_g$ as the identity. We set $\Gamma_g = \tilde{\Gamma}_g/Z_g$ for $g \leq 2$ and $\Gamma_g = \tilde{\Gamma}_g$ for $g \geq 3$, and we consider from now on the natural action of Γ_g on $P\mathcal{MF}_g$. (If $g = 1$, there are standard identifications of Γ_1 with $PSL_2(\mathbf{Z})$ and of $P\mathcal{MF}_1$ with the boundary of the hyperbolic plane.) It is well-known that the action of Γ_g on $P\mathcal{MF}_g$ is minimal for all $g \geq 1$; see e.g. § VII of exposé 6 in [FLP–79].

A *pseudo-Anosov class* in Γ_g is an element which defines a hyperbolic homeomorphism of $P\mathcal{MF}_g$. It is known that Γ_g contains transverse pairs of pseudo-Anosov classes; this is for example an immediate consequence of Lemma 2.5 in [McP–89]. Let Γ be a subgroup of Γ_g which is *sufficiently large* (in the sense of [McP–89]), which means here that is contains a transverse pair of pseudo-Anosov classes. Then there is a unique subset L_Γ in $P\mathcal{MF}_g$ which is closed, invariant by Γ, and minimal for these properties; it is the *limit set* of Γ. If L^0_Γ is the subset of $P\mathcal{MF}_g$ of those points which are fixed by some pseudo-Anosov class in Γ, then L_Γ is the closure of L^0_Γ (see Theorem 4.1 in [McP–89]). For example and as recalled above, we have $L_\Gamma = P\mathcal{MF}_g$ if $\Gamma = \Gamma_g$. It follows from the definitions that the action of the group Γ on its limit set L_Γ is minimal and strongly hyperbolic.

We claim that the action of Γ on L_Γ is also strongly faithful. Indeed, let F be a finite subset of Γ, not containing the identity. If m is the number of elements of F, choose an integer $n > \frac{m}{2}$ and pairwise transverse pseudo-Anosov classes $h_1, \ldots, h_n \in \Gamma$. Let X denote the $2n$-element subset of L_Γ consisting of the points fixed by one of the h_j 's. Because of Lemma 2.5 in [McP–89] again, any element of Γ_g can fix at most one point in X. As $|X| = 2n > m = |F|$, there is at least one point $x_0 \in X$ such that $fx_0 \neq x_0$ for all $f \in F$. This ends the proof of the claim, and thus that of (iv). This proof of (iv) is that of [BrHa–04].

We refer to the same paper for a precise formulation and for a proof of (v). □

13. Questions. *(i) A Powers group is clearly non-amenable, and is icc*[8] *(see Proposition 1 in* [Har–85]*). Does there exist Powers groups without non-abelian free subgroups?*

(ii) Let Γ be a direct product of two non-abelian free group. Does there exist a faithful action of Γ by homeomorphisms on a Hausdorff space such that at least one element of the group acts hyperbolically?

(iii) Does there exist an action of $SL_3(\mathbf{Z})$ by homeomorphisms on a Hausdorff space such that at least one element of the group acts hyperbolically?

[8] A group Γ has *infinite conjugacy classes,* or shortly is *icc,* if it is infinite and if all its conjugacy classes distinct from $\{1\}$ are infinite. More on icc groups on Part X of the appendix.

Questions (ii) and (iii) are possibly related to the notions of *Dynkin spaces* and $\mathcal{D}$*-groups*, defined by Furstenberg in [Fur–67]; but I have not understood enough of this paper to use it.

14. Theorem (Powers). *Powers groups are* C^**-simple.*

Proof, which follows that of [Pow–75]. Consider a Powers group Γ, its left-regular representation λ, a non-zero ideal $\mathcal{I}$ of its reduced C*-algebra, and an element $U \neq 0$ in $\mathcal{I}$. We want to show that $\mathcal{I}$ contains an element Z such that $\|Z - 1\| < 1$, and in particular such that Z is invertible (with inverse $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} Z^n$).

Upon replacing U by a scalar multiple of U^*U, we may assume that $U = 1 + X$ and $X = \sum_{x \in \Gamma, x \neq 1} z_x \lambda(x)$, with $z_x \in \mathbf{C}$. Choose $\epsilon > 0$, with $\epsilon < 1$; there exists a finite subset F of $\Gamma \setminus \{1\}$ such that, if

$$X' \,=\, \sum_{f \in F} z_f \lambda(f),$$

then $\|X' - X\| < \epsilon$. Set $U' = 1 + X'$, so that $\|U' - U\| < \epsilon$. Choose an integer N so large that $\frac{2}{\sqrt{N}} \|X'\| < 1 - \epsilon$.

Let now $\Gamma = C \sqcup D$ and $\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_N$ be as in the definition of the Powers property. Set

$$V \,=\, \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \lambda(\gamma_j) U \lambda(\gamma_j^{-1}) \qquad\qquad V' \,=\, \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \lambda(\gamma_j) U' \lambda(\gamma_j^{-1})$$

$$Y \,=\, \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \lambda(\gamma_j) X \lambda(\gamma_j^{-1}) \qquad\qquad Y' \,=\, \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \lambda(\gamma_j) X' \lambda(\gamma_j^{-1})$$

so that $V = 1 + Y \in \mathcal{I}$ and $V' = 1 + Y'$. We show below that $\|Y'\| < 1 - \epsilon$. This implies that $\|Y\| \leq \|Y'\| + \|Y - Y'\| \leq \|Y'\| + \|X - X'\| < 1$. As $\mathcal{I}$ contains the invertible element $V = 1 + Y$, the C*-algebra $C^*_{red}(\Gamma)$ is indeed simple.

For $j \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$, denote by P_j the orthogonal projection of $\ell^2(\Gamma)$ onto $\ell^2(\gamma_j D)$. We have

$$(1 - P_j) \lambda(\gamma_j) X' \lambda(\gamma_j^{-1}) (1 - P_j) \,=\, 0;$$

indeed, since $fC \cap C = \emptyset$ for all $f \in F$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Big(\lambda(\gamma_j) X' \lambda(\gamma_j^{-1}) (1 - P_j) \Big) (\ell^2(\Gamma)) \;&\subset\; \Big(\lambda(\gamma_j) X' \Big) (\ell^2(C)) \\ &\subset\; \Big(\lambda(\gamma_j) \Big) (\ell^2(D)) \;=\; P_j(\ell^2(\Gamma)). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$V' \,=\, 1 \,+\, \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} P_j \lambda(\gamma_j) X' \lambda(\gamma_j^{-1}) \,+\, \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} P_j \lambda(\gamma_j) X' \lambda(\gamma_j^{-1}) (1 - P_j) \right)^* .$$

Since the subsets $\gamma_j D$ of Γ are pairwise disjoint, the operators $X'_j \doteqdot P_j \lambda(\gamma_j) X' \lambda(\gamma_j^{-1})$ have pairwise orthogonal ranges in $\ell^2(\Gamma)$, and we have

$$\left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} X'_j \right\| \,\leq\, \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \max_{j=1}^{n} \left\| X'_j \right\| \,\leq\, \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \left\| X' \right\| .$$

Similarly

$$\left\| \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} X'_j (1 - P_j) \right)^* \right\| = \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} X'_j (1 - P_j) \right\| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \|X'\| .$$

Consequently

$$\|Y'\| = \|V' - 1\| \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{N}} \|X'\| < 1 - \epsilon.$$

As already observed, this ends the proof. □

There is in Section 6 of [BeLo–00] a formulation of the previous proof in terms of functions of positive type.

There are several weak forms of the Powers property which imply C*-simplicity. One of them has been introduced by Boca and Nitica [BoNi–88], and has been used to establish that the groups P_k/C_k and B_k/C_k are simple for all $k \geq 3$ (see [GiHa–91] and [BeHa–00]); here, B_k stands for the Artin braid group on k strings, P_k for its subgroup of pure braids, and C_k for their common center (which is infinite cyclic). Other notions, reminiscent of the Power property, have been introduced and studied in [Béd–91], [Béd–93], [Béd–96], and [BoNi–90].

Let us end this section by some historical information that we have learned from R. Kadison (see also [Val–89]). In a conversation with him of 1949, I. Kaplansky asked whether any simple C*-algebra with unit other than $\mathbf{C}$ has a projection distinct from 0 and 1. In 1968, Kadison suggested to R. Powers to study from this point of view the reduced C*-algebra $C^*_{red}(F_2)$ of the free group of rank 2. Powers showed within a week that it is simple (even if he published this seven years later). But it was only in 1982 that M. Pimsner and D. Voiculescu showed that $C^*_{red}(F_2)$ does not have any non-trivial idempotent [PiV–82]. Shortly before, Blackadar had shown the first examples of C*-algebras without non-trivial idempotent [Bla–80, Bla–81].

4. Other examples of C*-simple groups

Let G be a non-compact simple connected real Lie group and let Γ be a Zariski-dense subgroup of G with centre reduced to one element. If G has real rank one, we can consider the action of Γ on the sphere at infinity of the hyperbolic space defined by G; then Γ contains enough hyperbolic homeomorphisms, and the argument of Proposition 11 shows that Γ is a Powers group.

If G has higher real rank, the action of Γ on an appropriate "boundary" does not give rise to hyperbolic homeomorphisms with two fixed points each; but there are elements acting in a rather simple way, with finitely many fixed points which are sources, sinks and saddle-type points. This simple dynamics can be used to show the following combinatorial property :

for any finite subset F of $\Gamma \setminus \{1\}$,
there exist $y_0 \in \Gamma$ and subsets $U, A_1, \ldots, A_N$ in Γ such that
(i) $\Gamma \setminus U \subset A_1 \cup \ldots \cup A_N$,
(ii) $fU \cap U = \emptyset$ for all $f \in F$,
(iii) $y_0^{-j} A_s \cap A_s = \emptyset$ for all $j \geq 0$ and $s \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$.

And this property is sufficient to imply the following result, from [BCH2–94].

15. Theorem. *Let G be a connected real semisimple Lie group without compact factors. Let H be a subgroup of G with trivial centre, whose image in the adjoint group of the Lie algebra of G is Zariski-dense, and let Γ be the group H together with the discrete topology. Then Γ is C*-simple.*

Theorem 15 shows for example that $PSL_n(\mathbf{K})$ is C*-simple for any $n \geq 2$ and for $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{Q}$, or more generally for $\mathbf{K}$ a number field.

The proof of Theorem 15 which is presently available is substancially longer than that of Powers Theorem 14. A positive answer to the following question would provide a shorter proof, and be of independent interest. (For simplicity, we consider here torsion-free groups; for groups which have torsion, see [BCH2–94].)

16. Question. *Let Γ be a group as in Theorem 15. Is it true that, for any finite subset F of $\Gamma \setminus \{1\}$, there exists $y \in \Gamma$ such that the subgroup $\langle x, y \rangle$ of Γ generated by x and y is free of rank two for all $x \in F$?*

The answer is "yes" if G has real rank one. The question makes sense for G a semisimple algebraic group over the p-adics. The next question is related to Question 13.i.

17. Question. *Does there exist a countable group which is C*-simple and which does not contain non-abelian free subgroups?*

It is essentially a theorem of Fendler, and also a consequence of Theorem 15, that an irreducible Coxeter group which is neither finite nor affine is C*-simple. As both the original paper [Fen–03] and a later paper [BtHa–05] prove this with a non-necessary extra hypothesis, let us revisit this result. Consider

- an irreducible Coxeter system (W, S), with a finite set S of generators,
- the free real vector space $E = R^S$ on S,
- the Tits form B on E,
- the kernel $E_0 = \{v \in E \mid B(v, w) = 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad w \in E\}$ of B,
- the orthogonal group $Of(E, B)$ of those linear automorphisms g of E such that $B(gv, gw) = B(v, w)$ for all $v, w \in E$ and $gv = v$ for all $v \in E_0$,
- the geometric representation $\sigma : W \longrightarrow Of(E, B)$, which is faithful (Tits theorem),
- the non-degenerate symmetric bilinear form $\tilde{B}$ induced by B on the quotient space $\tilde{E} = E/E_0$,
- the corresponding orthogonal group $O(\tilde{E}, \tilde{B})$ and the canonical projection π from $Of(E, B)$ onto $O(\tilde{E}, \tilde{B})$,
- and the composition $\tilde{\sigma} : W \longrightarrow O(\tilde{E}, \tilde{B})$ of σ and π.

It is standard that W is finite if and only if B is positive definite. It is equally standard that W is infinite and contains a free abelian group of finite index if and only if B is positive and $\dim_{\mathbf{R}}(E_0) \geq 1$; in this case, W is said to be *affine*. For all this, see for example [Bou–68].

Assume moreover that W is neither finite nor affine. Fendler has shown that W is C*-simple under the extra condition that B is non degenerate, namely that E_0 is reduced to zero. The extra assumption is redundant:

18. Corollary. *An irreducible Coxeter group which is neither finite nor affine is C*-simple.*

Proof. Let the notation be as above. It is a result of Vinberg that the representation $\tilde{\sigma}$ of W is faithful; see Proposition 13 in [Vin–71], as well as Proposition 6.1.3 in [Kra], and [Cor]. It follows from [BtHa–05] that its image is Zariski-dense in $O(\tilde{E}, \tilde{B})$. It is then a consequence of Theorem 15 that W is C*-simple; details are as in [BtHa–05]. □

Let us state some hereditary properties of C*-simplicity.

19. Proposition. (*i*) *The direct product of two C*-simple groups is C*-simple.*

(*ii*) *An inductive limit of C*-simple groups is C*-simple.*

(*iii*) *In a C*-simple group, any subgroup of finite index is C*-simple.*

(*iv*) *Let Γ be a group which has a C*-simple subgroup of finite index. Then Γ is C*-simple if and only if it is icc.*

Proof. For (*i*), see [Tak–64]. For (*ii*), which is an exercise, (*iii*), and (*iv*), see [BeHa–00]. For (*iii*) and (*iv*), see also [Pop–00]. □

In all examples of a countable group Γ for which it is known that $C^*_{red}(\Gamma)$ is simple, it is also known that the canonical trace on $C^*_{red}(\Gamma)$ is the unique tracial state. Indeed, it is an open problem to know whether there exists a group such that $C^*_{red}(\Gamma)$ is simple with several tracial states, or a group such that $C^*_{red}(\Gamma)$ has a unique tracial state and is not simple.

For Γ a group as in one of Theorems 14 and 15, it is known that a reduced crossed product $A \rtimes_{red} \Gamma$ is simple if and only the only Γ-invariant ideals of the C*-algebra A are 0 and A. Thus, for example, if Γ is a torsion-free hyperbolic group with Gromov boundary $\partial\Gamma$, the crossed product $\mathcal{C}(\partial\Gamma) \rtimes_{red} \Gamma$ defined by the action of Γ on its boundary is a simple C*-algebra. More on these algebras in [Ana–97].

Observe that, if Γ is a group acting on a C*-algebra A, the condition that the only Γ-invariant ideals in A are 0 and A is always necessary for $A \rtimes_{red} \Gamma$ to be simple. If Γ is not a Powers group, this condition needs not be sufficient: when $\Gamma = \mathbf{Z}$ acts on $\mathbf{C}$, the reduced crossed product is $C^*_{red}(\mathbf{Z}) \approx \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{S}^1)$, which is far from being simple.

20. A computational consequence of C*-simplicity. The knowledge that a group is C*-simple is not only a qualitative result, but can sometimes be used in computations. Consider for example the natural measure-preserving action of $\tilde{\Gamma} = GL(2, \mathbf{Z})$ on the 2-torus $\mathbf{T}^2$, and the corresponding measure preserving action of $\Gamma = PGL(2, \mathbf{Z})$ on the 2-sphere $\mathbf{S}^2$, which is the quotient of $\mathbf{T}^2$ by the action of the centre of $\tilde{\Gamma}$, as in [Sch–80].

The unitary representation $\tilde{\pi}$ of $\tilde{\Gamma}$ in the space $L^2_0(\mathbf{T}^2) = \left\{\xi \in L^2(\mathbf{T}^2) \mid \int_{\mathbf{T}^2} \xi(t)dt = 0\right\}$ is weakly contained in the regular representation of $\tilde{\Gamma}$; to check this, observe that $L^2_0(\mathbf{T}^2)$ can be seen as an orthogonal direct sum of ℓ^2-spaces corresponding to the orbits of $\tilde{\Gamma}$ in $\mathbf{Z}^2 \setminus \{0\}$, namely of ℓ^2-spaces of the form $\ell^2(\tilde{\Gamma}/N)$ with N amenable. It follows that the representation π of Γ on the space $L^2_0(\mathbf{S}^2) = \left\{\xi \in L^2(\mathbf{S}^2) \mid \int_{\mathbf{S}^2} \xi(x)d\nu(x) = 0\right\}$ is weakly contained in λ_Γ (where $d\nu(x)$ is the measure on $\mathbf{S}^2$ which is the direct image of the Lebesgue measure dt on $\mathbf{T}^2$). On the other hand, it follows from Proposition 19 that $PGL(2, \mathbf{Z})$ is C*-simple (details in [BeHa–00]).

Hence $\|\pi(\mu)\| = \|\lambda_\Gamma(\mu)\|$ for any finite measure (positive or not) on Γ. Computations of norms like $\|\lambda_\Gamma(\mu)\|$, at least for positive measures on Γ, go back to Kesten's theorems on random walks on groups [Kes–59].

Appendix

I. On the definition of weak containment (Definition 1).

Let G be a locally compact group, $\rho : G \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\sigma : G \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{K})$ two unitary representations, $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$, and $\varphi_{\xi,\xi}$ the corresponding diagonal matrix coefficient of ρ; for simplicity, we assume that $\|\xi\| = 1$. Then the following are equivalent:

(i) $\varphi_{\xi,\xi}$ is a limit of sums of diagonal matrix coefficients of σ, uniformly on compact subsets of G (as in Section 1),

(ii) $\varphi_{\xi,\xi}$ is a limit of convex combinations of diagonal matrix coefficients of σ, uniformly on compact subsets of G.

If π is moreover irreducible, these conditions are also equivalent to:

(iii) $\varphi_{\xi,\xi}$ is a limit of diagonal matrix coefficients of σ, uniformly on compact subsets of G.

The equivalence of (i) and (ii) is an easy exercise: if $\varphi_{\xi,\xi}$ is a limit of sums $\sum_{j=1}^{n} \psi_j$, uniformly on compact subsets of G, we can assume that these compact subsets contain 1, so that $\sum_{j=1}^{n} \psi_j(1)$ is near $\varphi_{\xi,\xi}(1) = 1$. Then $\varphi_{\xi,\xi}$ is also a limit of convex combinations $\sum_{j=1}^{n} c_j \tilde{\psi}_j$, with $c_j = \psi_j(1)/(\psi_1(1) + \cdots + \psi_n(1))$ and $\tilde{\psi}_j = \psi_j/\psi_j(1)$. The proof of the equivalence with (iii) is more technical, and we refer to Appendix F of [BeHV].

II. On weak equivalence not preserving irreducibility.

Consider a group Γ which is not reduced to one element. The *right-regular representation* ρ_Γ of Γ acts on the space $\ell^2(\Gamma)$; it is defined by $(\rho_\Gamma(\gamma)\xi)(x) = \xi(\gamma x)$ for all $\gamma, x \in \Gamma$ and $\xi \in \ell^2(\Gamma)$. In the algebra of all operators on $\ell^2(\Gamma)$, the commutant of $C^*_{red}(\Gamma)$ contains $\rho_\Gamma(\Gamma)$; it follows from Shur's lemma that λ_Γ is reducible[9].

Assume moreover that Γ is *icc.* Then the representation λ_Γ is factorial, by Lemma 5.3.4 of [ROIV]. Recall that a representation $\pi : G \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H})$ of a locally compact group G is *factorial* if, for any $\pi(G)$-invariant decomposition $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2$ with $\mathcal{H}_1 \neq \{0\} \neq \mathcal{H}_2$, there exists a non-zero G-intertwining operator from $\mathcal{H}_1$ to $\mathcal{H}_2$; equivalently, π is factorial if the von Neumann algebra $W^*_\pi(G)$ generated by $C^*_\pi(G)$ has a center reduced to the multiples of the identity (see Corollary 5.2.5 of [DC*–69]). Now, the kernel of any factorial representation of a separable C*-algebra is primitive, which means that is is also the kernel of an irreducible representation of the same algebra (Corollary 3 of Theorem 2 in [Dix–60], or Lemma 2 in [BeHa–00] and Proposition 4.3.6 in [Ped–79]). As a consequence, we have:

21. Proposition. *For an icc group Γ, the left regular representation λ_Γ, which is reducible, is weakly equivalent to an irreducible representation.*

Let us provide two specific examples.

22. Example. *Case of a lattice Γ in $G = PSL_2(\mathbf{R})$.*

For $s \in \mathbf{R}_+$, let π^{Pr}_s denote the corresponding irreducible representation of the principal unitary series of G. It is a particular case of the results of [CoSt–91] that the restrictions $\pi^{Pr}_s|\Gamma$ to the lattice Γ are irreducible and pairwise non-equivalent. On the other hand,

[9] A natural question is to ask for explicit and elementary constructions of invariant subspaces. If Γ has at least one element of infinite order, there is a nice construction of this kind in [Aub–79], in terms of the commutant of $\lambda_\Gamma(\Gamma)$ and of Fourier series. I don't know any explicit construction in the case of an infinite torsion group.

$\pi_s^{Pr}|\Gamma \prec \lambda_\Gamma$, because $\pi_s^{Pr} \prec \lambda_G$, and weak containment is stable by restriction. Now for $s \neq s'$, the two representations π_s^{Pr}, $\pi_{s'}^{Pr}$ are not weakly equivalent (because they are not unitarily equivalent, and G is of type I), but $\pi_s^{Pr}|\Gamma$ and $\pi_{s'}^{Pr}|\Gamma$ are both weakly equivalent to λ_Γ (because Γ is C*-simple). This is an illustration of Glimm's theorem (see Part VI of the appendix).

For $t \in]0,1[$ and the corresponding irreducible representation π_t^{Co} of the complementary series of G, the restriction $\pi_t^{Co}|\Gamma$ is not weakly equivalent to λ_Γ. Moreover, if $t < t'$, the representation $\pi_t^{Co}|\Gamma$ is not weakly contained in $\pi_{t'}^{Co}|\Gamma$.

For all this, see [BeHa–94] and [Bek–97].

23. Example. *Other irreducible representations weakly equivalent to a left regular representation.*

Consider more generally a non-compact semi-simple connected real Lie group G with Iwasawa decomposition $G = KAN$, a maximal amenable subgroup $B = MAN$ of G, the characters χ_s of A viewed as one-dimensional representations of B, and the induced unitary representations $\rho = \mathrm{Ind}_B^G(\chi_s)$; restrict attention to those χ_s which provide irreducible ρ. Then the restrictions $\rho|\Gamma$ are irreducible, pairwise non-equivalent [CoSt-91], and all are weakly equivalent to λ_Γ.

The next example is a remarkable result of Yoshizawa: see [Yos–51], as well as Theorem VII.6.5 in [Dav–96].

24. Example. *For a non-abelian free group, the universal representation π_{uni} of Section 2 is weakly equivalent to an irreducible representation.*

With the method of [Dav–96], it is not difficult to extend this to a few other cases, for example to groups of the form $\Gamma_0 * \mathbf{Z} * (\mathbf{Z}/2\mathbf{Z})$ or $\Gamma_0 * \mathbf{Z} * \mathbf{Z}$ (where Γ_0 is an arbitrary countable group, and where $*$ indicates a free product). Observe also that, if Γ is an amenable icc group, its universal representation is weakly equivalent to its regular representation, and therefore weakly equivalent to an irreducible represenation (Proposition 21). However, we know very little in general:

25. Problem. *Find other groups for which the universal representation is weakly equivalent to an irreducible one.*

III. On diagonal and arbitrary matrix coefficients.

It is important that the definition of weak containment involves *diagonal matrix* coefficients, and not arbitrary matrix coefficients. To show the difference, let us consider the left-regular representation λ_Γ of a non-amenable finitely-generated group Γ.

Let $A(\Gamma)$ be the set of *all coefficients* of the form

$$\varphi_{\xi,\eta} : \begin{cases} \Gamma & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{C} \\ \gamma & \longmapsto & \langle \xi \mid \lambda_\Gamma(\gamma)\eta \rangle \end{cases}$$

with $\xi, \eta \in \ell^2(\Gamma)$; if $\tilde{\eta}$ is defined by $\tilde{\eta}(\gamma) = \overline{\eta(\gamma^{-1})}$, observe that $\varphi_{\xi,\eta}$ is the convolution $\xi * \tilde{\eta}$. It is a standard result that this *set* is a *linear subspace* of the commutative C*-algebra $\mathcal{C}_0(\Gamma)$ of all complex-valued functions on Γ vanishing at infinity (Page 218 in [Eym–64]).

On the one hand, since $\lambda_\Gamma \otimes \lambda_\Gamma$ is unitarily equivalent to a multiple of λ_Γ (see e.g. Complement 13.11.3 in [DC*–69]), it is a consequence of the Stone-Weierstrass theorem that $A(\Gamma)$ is a dense subalgebra of $\mathcal{C}_0(\Gamma)$. [It is the so-called *Fourier algebra* of Eymard.]

On the other hand, since Γ is not amenable, it follows from a classical result of Kesten [Kes–59] that there is no sequence of *diagonal* matrix coefficients, namely no sequence of coefficients of the form $(\varphi_{\xi_n,\xi_n})_{n\geq 1}$, which can converge towards a constant function, uniformly on all finite subsets of Γ. Indeed, for S a finite set of generators of Γ such that $S^{-1} = S$, say of size $|S| = d$, Kesten has shown that the self-adjoint operator $h = \frac{1}{d}\sum_{s\in S} \lambda_\Gamma(s)$ has spectrum contained in $[-1, 1-\epsilon]$ for some $\epsilon > 0$, or in other words that

$$\frac{1}{d}\sum_{s\in S} \varphi_{\xi,\xi}(s) \;=\; \frac{1}{d}\sum_{s\in S} \langle \xi | \lambda_\Gamma(s)\xi\rangle \;\leq\; 1-\epsilon$$

for any unit vector $\xi \in \mathcal{H}$. Hence there exists $s \in S$ with $\Re\,(\varphi_{\xi,\xi}(s)) \leq 1-\epsilon$. As $\varphi_{\xi,\xi}(1) = 1$, this shows that the restriction of $\varphi_{\xi,\xi}$ to the finite set $S \cup \{1\}$ is bounded away from a constant function.

IV. On a definition of Zimmer.

Definition 7.3.5 of [Zim–84] offers a *different definition* of weak containment. Consider two unitary representations ρ, σ of some group G. First, to a finite orthonormal set $\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_n$ of $\mathcal{H}_\rho$, we associate a continuous function

$$\varphi_{(\xi_1,\ldots,\xi_n)} \;:\; \begin{cases} G & \longrightarrow \quad Mat_n(\mathbf{C}) \\ g & \longmapsto \quad (\langle \xi_j \mid \rho(g)\xi_k\rangle)_{1\leq j,k\leq n} \end{cases}$$

which is called a *n-by-n submatrix of* ρ. Define then ρ to be *weakly contained in* σ *in the sense of Zimmer,* and write $\rho \overset{Z}{\prec} \sigma$, if any submatrix of ρ is a limit of submatrices of σ, uniformly on compact subsets of G. Two unitary representations are *weakly equivalent in the sense of Zimmer,* written $\rho \overset{Z}{\sim} \sigma$, if $\rho \overset{Z}{\prec} \sigma$ and $\sigma \overset{Z}{\prec} \rho$.

The definition of our Section 1 is that of Fell (see [Fel–60] and [Fel–64]) and Dixmier (see Items 3.4.5 and 18.1.4 in [DC*–69]).

The two notions are distinct. For example, if σ and ρ are finite-dimensional, then $\rho \overset{Z}{\prec} \sigma$ à la Zimmer if and only if ρ is a subrepresentation of σ in the naive sense, whereas $\rho \oplus \rho \prec \rho$. It is a fact that the two notions are equivalent for irreducible representations, and indeed $\rho \prec \sigma \Longleftrightarrow \rho \overset{Z}{\prec} \sigma$ whenever ρ is irreducible. It is another fact that $\rho \prec \sigma$ à la Fell-Dixmier if and only if $\rho \overset{Z}{\prec} \infty\,\sigma$ à la Zimmer (where $\infty\,\sigma$ stands for an orthogonal sum of infinitely many copies of the representation σ).

V. Other notions of equivalence.

In case they are both *irreducible,* two unitary representations ρ, σ of a second-countable locally compact group G which are weakly equivalent are also *approximately unitarily equivalent relative to the compact operators,* in the following sense : there exists a sequence of unitary operators

$$(U_n : \mathcal{H}_\rho \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}_\sigma)_{n\geq 1}$$

such that

$$U_n\rho(x)U_n^* - \sigma(x) \quad \text{is compact} \quad \forall\, n \geq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \forall\, x \in C^*_{max}(G),$$
$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \|U_n\rho(x)U_n^* - \sigma(x)\| = 0 \quad \forall\, x \in C^*_{max}(G).$$

This follows from a deep result of D. Voiculescu [Voi–76]; see also Proposition VII.3.4 and Theorem II.5.6 in [Dav–96].

Note that there exist at least four notions of equivalence for two unitary representations ρ, σ of a second countable locally compact group G :

(i) unitary equivalence $\rho \approx_u \sigma$,
(ii) weak equivalence $\rho \sim \sigma$,
(iii) approximate unitary equivalence relative to the compact $\rho \sim_{\mathcal{K}} \sigma$,
(iv) quasi-equivalence $\rho \approx_{q.e.} \sigma$ (see § V in [DC*–69]).

In the particular case ρ and σ are irreducible, we have

$$\rho \approx_u \sigma \iff \rho \approx_{q.e.} \sigma \quad \text{(Proposition 5.33 in [DC*–69])},$$
$$\rho \sim \sigma \iff \rho \sim_{\mathcal{K}} \sigma \quad \text{(Voiculescu's result recalled above)},$$
$$\rho \approx_u \sigma \implies \rho \sim \sigma \quad \text{(obvious)},$$
$$\rho \approx_u \sigma \overset{\text{for } G \text{ of type I}}{\Longleftarrow} \rho \sim \sigma \quad \text{(see Part VI of the appendix)}.$$

VI. The dual of a group.

Let A be a C*-algebra, $\hat{A}$ the set of equivalence classes of irreducible representations of A and $Prim(A)$ the set of primitive two-sided ideals in A. As primitve ideals are precisely the kernels of irreducible representations, there is a canonical mapping from $\hat{A}$ onto $Prim(A)$. On $Prim(A)$, there is a natural topology called the *hull-kernel* or the *Fell-Jacobson* topology, for which the closure of a subset S is defined to be the set of primitive ideals of A containing $\cap_{\mathcal{I}\in S}\mathcal{I}$. By definition, the *spectrum* of A is the set $\hat{A}$ together with the topology pulled back from the hull-kernel topology on the primitive ideal space. There are other definitions of the same topology; moreover, if A is separable, this topology is compatible with the appropriate "Mackey Borel structure" on $\hat{A}$. (See Theorems 3.4.11 and 3.5.8, as well as Proposition 3.1.3, in [DC*–69].) This topology is useful to decompose arbitrary representations as "direct integrals" of irreducible ones, and also for the study of the structure of C*-algebras.

The dual $\hat{G}$ of a second-countable locally compact group G is the spectrum of its maximal C*-algebra $C^*_{max}(G)$. For irreducible representations ρ, σ of G, it follows from the definitions that $\rho \prec \sigma$ if and only if $\rho \in \overline{\{\sigma\}}$.

The following theorem, for its main part due to Glimm, is fundamental. See [Gli–61], § 9 of [DC*–69], Theorem 6.8.7 in [Ped–79], and [Mar–75] (of which the last statement of the theorem below is a special case). In the particular case of the maximal C*-algebra of a second-countable locally compact group, we can replace "irreducible representation of A" by "irreducible unitary representation of G" and $\hat{A}$ by $\hat{G}$.

26. Theorem. *Let A be a separable C*-algebra. The following properties are equivalent :*

(i) *the canonical mapping $\hat{A} \longrightarrow Prim(A)$ is a bijection,*
(ii) *the image of any irreducible representation of A contains some non-zero compact operator,*
(iii) *the image of any irreducible representation of A contains all compact operators,*
(iv) *the appropriate Borel structure on $\hat{A}$ is countably separated,*
(v) *two irreducible representations of A are equivalent if and only if they are weakly equivalent,*

and they imply

(vi) *the spectrum $\hat{A}$ contains an open dense subset which is locally compact.*

Moreover, if A does not *have these properties, for any injective factor M of type II_∞ or III, there exists an irreducible representation ρ of A such that $\rho(A)$ generates M.*

VII. Groups of Type I.

A C*-algebra which has the properties of Theorem 26 is said to be *of type I.* A second countable locally compact group G is of type I if $C^*_{max}(G)$ is of type I.

Groups of type I include include connected real Lie groups which are either nilpotent or real algebraic, the "$ax + b$-group" (the affine group over $\mathbf{R}$) and various other soluble real Lie groups (caracterized in [AuKo–71]), p-adic linear groups which are either reductive [Ber–74] or soluble [GoKa–79], large classes of adelic groups [GGP–69], countable groups which have normal abelian groups of finite index, but *no other countable group* [Tho–68].

There is an existence theorem according to which we can "decompose" any unitary representation in a separable Hilbert space as a direct integral of irreducible representations. For a group of type I, this decomposition is essentially unique (Sections 8.5 and 8.6 in [DC*–69]). But this uniqueness fails completely for other groups; specific examples are worked out for the affine group over $\mathbf{Q}$ in Section 3.5 of [Mac–76] and for the free group on two generators in Chapter 19 of [Rob–83].

A C*-simple group $\neq \{1\}$ is never of type I.

VIII. The reduced dual.

The *reduced dual* of a second-countable locally compact group G is the spectrum $\hat{G}_{red}$ of its reduced C*-algebra, or equivalently the space of those irreducible unitary representations of G which are weakly contained in λ_G. The canonical embedding of $\hat{G}_{red}$ in $\hat{G}$ has a closed image, and is onto if and only if G is amenable.

When Γ is C*-simple, any irreducible representation in $\hat{\Gamma}_{red}$ is weakly equivalent to λ_Γ, and $\hat{\Gamma}_{red}$ is the closure of any of its points ! See Examples 22 and 23 for specific examples.

For irreducible representations of free groups which are weakly equivalent to the regular representation, see [PySz–86], [Szw–88], [KuSt–92], and [BuHa–97, Proposition 4.1].

There is a criterium, involving an appropriate growth condition, for a function of positive type on a non-abelian free group to be associated with the reduced dual of the group [Haa–79]. The result and its proof hold for some other groups, such as Gromov-hyperbolic Coxeter groups, as observed in Section 2 of [JoVa–91].

IX. The Dixmier property.

Let A be a C*-algebra with unit 1_A. For $a \in A$, set

$$C_A(a) \,=\, \overline{\text{conv}}\big\{uau^* \mid u \in A,\, uu^* = u^*u = 1_A\big\} \,\cap\, \mathbf{C}1_A$$

where $\overline{\text{conv}}$ indicates the norm-closed convex hull. Then A has the *Dixmier property* if $C_A(a) \neq \emptyset \;\forall\; a \in A$. Dixmier has shown that a C*-algebra which has a tracial state and which has the Dixmier property has a unique tracial state and is simple (see [DvN–69], Chapter III, Sections 5.1, 5.2, 8.5 and 8.6). A result of [HaZs–84] shows that, if A has a unique tracial state tr (e.g. if A is the reduced C*-algebras of a Powers group), then $C_A(a)$ is reduced to a unique element, which is $tr(a)1_A$.

The main step in the proof of Theorem 14 shows that the set $C_A(U)$, which is obviously inside the ideal $\mathcal{I}$, contains an invertible element (U is the element of the ideal $\mathcal{I}$ chosen at the beginning of the proof of Theorem 14). As

$$tr(U) \,=\, tr\left(1 + \sum_{x\in\Gamma, x\neq 1} z_x\lambda(x)\right) \,=\, 1,$$

we have indeed $C_A(U) = \{1_A\}$, and the strategy of the proof of Theorem 14 should not be surprising.

S. Popa has used his "relative Dixmier property" to show Claims (*iii*) and (*iv*) of our Proposition 19.

X. On the icc condition.

For a group Γ, denote by Γ_f the union of the finite conjugacy classes of Γ. It is clearly a subgroup of Γ which is normal, indeed characteristic; let us check that Γ_f is also amenable.

It is enough to check that any subgroup Δ of Γ_f generated by a finite set $\{s_1, \ldots, s_n\}$ is amenable. Since the conjugacy class of each s_j is finite (both in Γ and in Δ), the centralizer $Z_\Delta(s_j)$ of s_j in Δ is a subgroup of finite index; thus the intersection $Z = \bigcap_{1\leq j\leq n} Z_\Delta(s_j)$ is also of finite index in Δ. Since Z is contained in the centre of Δ, the group Δ contains a normal abelian subgroup of finite index, and is therefore amenable.

Recall from the footnote to Item 13 that Γ is icc if $\Gamma \neq \{1\}$ and $\Gamma_f = \{1\}$. It follows from Proposition 3 that a C*-simple group is icc. The converse is far from being true; for example, the group Σ of permutations of finite support of an infinite countable set is amenable (because it is locally finite), and therefore not C*-simple, though Σ is clearly an icc group.

The Murray and von Neumann lemma from [ROIV] already quoted in Part II of the appendix shows that the von Neumann algebra $W^*(\Gamma)$ is a factor[10] of type II_1 if and only if the group Γ is icc. The previous observations show that the icc condition is also necessary for the reduced C*-algebra $C^*_{red}(\Gamma)$ to be simple. Short of suggesting general necessary and sufficient conditions on Γ for $C^*_{red}(\Gamma)$ to be simple, we would like to end this report by stating three problems.

[10]Recall that a von Neumann algebra M is a factor of type II_1 if it is infinite dimensional, simple, and finite in the following sense: for $x, y \in M$, we have $xy = 1$ if and only if $yx = 1$.

27. Problem. *Let Γ be the free product with amalgamation defined by two groups Γ_1, Γ_2 and a common subgroup Γ_0. Find necessary and*[11] *sufficient conditions for Γ to be icc, and for Γ to be C*-simple.*

For the particular case of free products ($\Gamma_0 = \{1\}$), here is one formulation of the classical solution of Problem 27. Assume that neither Γ_1 nor Γ_2 is reduced to one element; for the free product $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 * \Gamma_2$, the three following conditions are equivalent:

(i) Γ is not the infinite dihedral group $(\mathbf{Z}/2\mathbf{Z}) * (\mathbf{Z}/2\mathbf{Z})$;
(ii) Γ is icc;
(iii) Γ is C*-simple.

(This follows from [PaSa–79], or from Corollary 12.i.)

For the case of Problem 27, an almost obvious sufficient condition for Γ to be icc is that one at least of the two groups Γ_1, Γ_2 is icc. There is a sufficient condition for Γ to be C*-simple in [Béd–84].

28. Problem. *Let Γ be the HNN extension defined by a group Γ_1 and an isomorphism φ from a subgroup Γ_0 onto another subgroup Γ_0' of Γ_1. Find necessary and sufficient conditions for Γ to be icc, and for Γ to be C*-simple.*

There are partial answers for the icc condition in [Sta] and [HaPr].

Let M be an orientable connected compact manifold of dimension 3 and let Γ denote its fundamental group; we assume that Γ is infinite. In case M is a Seifert manifold, it is known that Γ contains an infinite cyclic normal subgroup, so that in particular Γ is not icc. We have shown that, conversely, if Γ is not the fundamental group of a Seifert 3-manifold, then Γ is icc (see [HaPr], which contains also a discussion of the non-orientable case).

29. Problem. *Let Γ be the fundamenal group of an orientable connected compact manifold of dimension 3 which is not the fundamental group of a Seifert 3-manifold. When is Γ C*-simple?*

I am grateful to Bachir Bekka for numerous comments on the material of this exposition, and to Alain Valette for useful observations.

References

Ana–97. C. Anantharaman-Delaroche, *Purely infinite C*-algebras arising from dynamical systems*, Bull. Soc. math. France **125** (1997), 199–225.

Aub–79. P.L. Aubert, *Projecteurs dans $\mathcal{U}(G)$: un exemple*, in "Algèbres d'opérateurs, Les Plans-sur-Bex, 1978", P. de la Harpe, Editor, Springer Lecture Notes in Math. **725** (1979), 17–18.

AuKo–71. L. Auslander and B. Kostant, *Polarization and unitary representations of solvable Lie groups*, Inventiones math. **14** (1971), 255–354.

BaKM–97. L.W. Baggett, E. Kaniuth, and W. Moran, *Primitive ideal spaces, characters, and Kirillov theory for discrete nilpotent groups*, J. Functional Analysis **150** (1997), 175–203.

BaVi. L. Bartholdi and B. Virag, *Amenability via random walks*, Preprint, arXiv:math.GR/0305262.

BCH1–94. M. Bekka, M. Cowling and P. de la Harpe, *Simplicity of the reduced C*-algebra of $PSL(n, \mathbf{Z})$*, Inter. Math. Res. Not. **7** (1994), 285–291.

BCH2–94. M. Bekka, M. Cowling and P. de la Harpe, *Some groups whose reduced C*-algebra is simple*, Publ. Math. I.H.E.S. **80** (1994), 117–134.

Béd–84. E. Bédos, *Operator algebras associated with free products of groups with amalgamation*, Math. Ann. **266** (1984), 279–286.

[11] Short of this, find necessary *or* sufficient conditions!

Béd–91. E. Bédos, *Discrete groups and simple C*-algebras*, Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. **109** (1991), 521–537.

Béd–93. E. Bédos, *On the uniqueness of the trace on some simple C*-algebras*, J. Operator Theory **30** (1993), 149–160.

Béd–96. E. Bédos, *Simple C*-crossed products with a unique trace*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **16** (1996), 415–429.

Bek–97. M. Bekka, *Restrictions of unitary representations to lattices and associated C*-algebras*, J. Functional Analysis **143** (1997), 33–41.

BeHa–94. M. Bekka and P. de la Harpe, *Représentations d'un groupe faiblement équivalentes à la représentation régulière*, Bull. Soc. math. France **122** (1994), 333-342.

BeHa–00. M. Bekka and P. de la Harpe, *Groups with simple reduced C*-algebras*, Expositiones Math. **18** (2000), 215–230.

BeHV. B. Bekka, P. de la Harpe, and A. Valette, *Kazhdan's Property (T)*, book in preparation. See http://www.unige.ch/math/biblio/?preprint/liste.html (2005).

BeLo–00. M. Bekka and N. Louvet, *Some properties of C*-algebras associated to discrete linear groups*, in "C*-algebras, Münster, 1999" (Springer, 2000), 1–22.

BeVa–95. M.E.B. Bekka and A. Valette, *Lattices in semi-simple Lie groups, and multiplies of group C*-algebras*, in "Recent advances in operator algebras, Orléans, 1992", Astérisque **232**, Soc. math. France (1995), 67–79.

Ber–74. I.N. Bernstein, *All reductive p-adic groups are of type I*, Functional Anal. Appl. **8** (1974), 91-93.

Bla–80. B. Blackadar, *A simple C*-algebra with no nontrivial projections*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **78** (1980), 63–71.

Bla–81. B. Blackadar, *A simple unital projectionless C*-algebra*, J. Operator Theory **5** (1981), 63–71.

BoNi–88. F. Boca and V. Nitica, *Combinatorial properties of groups and simple C*-algebras*, J. Operator Theory **20** (1988), 183–196.

BoNi–90. F. Boca and V. Nitica, *Extensions of groups and simple C*-algebras*, Operator Theory Adv. and Appl. **43** (1990), 123–130.

Bou–68. N. Bourbaki, *Groupes et algèbres de Lie, chapitres 4, 5 et 6*, Hermann, 1968.

BrHa–04. M. Bridson and P. de la Harpe, *Mapping class groups and outer automorphism groups of free groups are C*-simple*, J. Functional Analysis **212** (2004), 195–205.

BtHa–05. Y. Benoist and P. de la Harpe, *Adhérence de Zariski des groupes de Coxeter*, Compositio Math. **140** (2005), 1357–1366.

BuHa–97. M. Burger and P. de la Harpe, *Constructing irreducible representations of discrete groups*, Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. (Math. Sci.) **107** (1997), 223–235.

CeGH–99. T. Ceccherini-Silberstein, R. Grigorchuk, and P. de la Harpe, *Amenability and paradoxes for pseudogroups and for discrete metric spaces*, Proc. Steklov Inst. Math. **224** (1999), 57–95.

Cor. Y. de Cornulier, *Semisimple Zariski closure of Coxeter groups*, Unpublished note, 2005 [available at http://www.eleves.ens.fr/home/decornul/math.html].

CoSt–91. M. Cowling and T. Steger, *The irreducibility of restrictions of unitary representations to lattices*, J. reine angew. Math. **420** (1991), 85-98.

Dav–96. K.R. Davidson, *C*-algebras by example*, Fields Institute Monographs **6**, Amer. Math. Soc., 1996.

Day–57. M.M. Day, *Amenable semigroups*, Illinois J. Math. **1** (1957), 509–544.

Dix–60. J. Dixmier, *Sur les C*-algèbres*, Bull. Soc. math. France **88** (1960), 95–112.

DC*–69. J. Dixmier, *Les C*-algèbres et leurs représentations*, Gauthier-Villars, 1969.

DvN–69. J. Dixmier, *Les algèbres d'opérateurs dans l'espace hilbertien (algèbres de von Neumann), deuxième édition*, Gauthier-Villars, 1969.

Eym–64. P. Eymard, *L'algèbre de Fourier d'un groupe localement compact*, Bull. Soc. math. France **92** (1964), 181–236.

FLP–79. A. Fathi, F. Laudenbach and V. Ponéaru, *Travaux de Thurston sur les surfaces*, Astérisque **66–67**, Soc. math. France, 1979.

Fel–60. J.M.G. Fell, *The dual spaces of C*-algebras*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **94** (1960), 365–403.

Fel–64. J.M.G. Fell, *Weak containment and induced representations of groups, II*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **110** (1964), 424–447.

Fen–03. G. Fendler, *Simplicity of the reduced C*-algebras of certain Coxeter groups*, Illinois J. Math. **47** (2003), 883–897.

Fur–67. H. Furstenberg, *Poisson boundaries and envelopes of discrete groups*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **73** (1967), 350–356.

GGP–69. I.M. Gelfand, M.I. Graev, and I.I. Piatetski-Shapiro, *Representation theory and automorphic functions*, Saunders, 1969.

GiHa–91. T. Giordano and P. de la Harpe, *Groupes de tresses et moyennabilité intérieure*, Arkiv för Mat. **29** (1991), 63–72.

Gli–61. J. Glimm, *Type I C^*-algebras*, Annals of Math. **73** (1961), 572–612.

GoKa–79. E.C. Gootman and R.R. Kallman, *The left regular representation of a p-adic algebraic group is type I*, in "Studies in algebra and number theory", G.C. Rota Editor, Academic Press (1979), 273-284.

GrZu–02. R. Grigorchuk and A. Zuk, *On a torsion-free weakly branch group defined by a three state automaton*, Internat. J. Algebra Comput **12** (2002), 223–246.

Haa–79. U. Haagerup, *An example of a nonnuclear C^*-algebra which has the metric approximation property*, Inventiones math. **50** (1979), 279-293.

Hal–51. P.R. Halmos, *Introduction to Hilbert space and the theory of spectral multiplicity, second edition*, Chelsea, 1957.

HaPr. P. de la Harpe and J.-P. Préaux, *Groupes fondamentaux des variétés de dimension* 3 *et algèbres d'opérateurs Prépublication* (2005).

Har–85. P. de la Harpe, *Reduced C^*-algebras of discrete groups which are simple with a unique trace*, in "Operator algebras and their connections with topology and ergodic theory (Buşteni, 1983)", 230–253, Lecture Notes in Math. **1132** (Springer 1985), 230–253.

Har–88. P. de la Harpe, *Groupes hyperboliques, algèbres d'opérateurs et un théorème de Jolissaint*, C.R. Acad. Sc. Paris, Série I **307** (1988), 771–774.

Har–95. P. de la Harpe, *Operator algebras, free groups and other groups*, in "Recent advances in operator algebras, Orléans, 1992", Astérisque **232**, Soc. math. France (1995), 121–153.

HaZs–84. U. Haagerup and L. Zsidó, *Sur la propriété de Dixmier pour les C^*-algèbres*, C. R. Acad. Sc. Paris **298** (1984), 173–176.

JoVa–91. P. Jolissaint and A. Valette, *Normes de Sobolev et convoluteurs bornés sur $L^2(G)$*, Ann. Inst. Fourier **41** (1991), 797–822.

Kan–96. E. Kaniuth, *Ideal theory in C^*-algebras of discrete groups*, in "Infinite-dimensional harmonic analysis (Tübingen, 1995)", H. Heyer and T. Kirai Editors, Gräbner, Tübingen (1996), 128–137.

Kes–59. H. Kesten, *Symmetric random walks on groups*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **92** (1959), 336–354.

Kir–74. A. Kirillov, *Eléments de la théorie des représentations*, Mir, 1974 [Russian original 1972].

Kir–04. A. Kirillov, *Lectures on the orbit method*, Graduate Studies in Math. **64**, Amer. Math. Soc., 1996.

Kra–94. D. Krammer, *The conjugacy problem for Coxeter groups*, Ph.D. thesis, Universiteit Utrecht, 1994 [available at http://www.maths.warwick.ac.uk∼daan/].

KuSt–92. G. Kuhn and T. Steger, *Boundary representations of the free group, I & II*, in "Harmonic analysis and discrete potential theory", M.A. Picardello Editor, Plenum Press (1992), 85–97.

Lan–65. S. Lang, *Algebra*, Addison-Wesley, 1965.

Mac–76. G.W. Mackey, *The theory of unitary group representations*, The Univ. of Chicago Press, 1976.

Mar–75. O. Maréchal, *Une remarque sur un théorème de Glimm*, Bull Sci. Math. **99** (1975), 41–44.

McP–89. J. McCarthy and A. Papadopoulos, *Dynamics on Thurston's sphere of projective measured foliat ions*, Comment. Math. Helvetici **64** (1989), 133–166.

PaSa–79. W. Paschke and N. Salinas, *C^*-algebras associated with the free products of groups*, Pacific J. Math. **82** (1979), 211–221.

Ped–79. G.K. Pedersen, *C^*-algebras and their automorphism groups*, Academic Press, 1979.

PiV–82. M. Pimsner and D. Voiculescu, *K-groups of reduced crossed products by free groups*, J. Operator Theory **8** (1982), 131–156.

Pop–00. S. Popa, *On the relative Dixmier property for inclusions of C^*-algebras*, J. Functional Analysis **171** (2000), 130–154.

Pow–75. R.T. Powers, *Simplicity of the C^*-algebra associated with the free group on two generators*, Duke Math. J. **42** (1975), 151–156.

PySz–86. T. Pytlik and R. Szwarc, *An analytic family of uniformly bounded representations of free groups*, Acta Math. **157** (1986), 287–309.

Rie–74. M. Rieffel, *Induced representations of C^*-algebras*, Adv. in Math. **13** (1974), 176–257.

ROIV. F.J. Murray and J. von Neumann, *On rings of operators, IV*, Annals of Math. **44** (1943), 716–808.

Rob–83. A. Robert, *Introduction to the representation theory of compact and locally compact groups*, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Series **80**, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1983.

Sch–80. K. Schmidt, *Asymptotically invariant sequences and an action of* $SL(2, \mathbf{Z})$ *on the* 2*–sphere*, Israel J. Math. **37** (1980), 193–208.

Ser–67. J-P. Serre, *Représentations linéaires des groupes finis*, Hermann, 1967.

Ser–83. J.-P. Serre, *Arbres, amalgames,* SL_2, Astérisque **46**, Soc. math. France 1983.

Sta. Y. Stalder, *Moyennabilité intérieure et extensions HNN*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (to appear).

Szw–88. R. Szwarc, *An analytic series of irreducible representations of the free group*, Ann. Inst. Fourier **38** (1988), 87–110.

Tak–64. M. Takesaki, *On the cross-norm of the direct product of* C^**-algebras*, Tôhoku Math. J. **16** (1964), 111–122.

Tho–68. E. Thoma, *Ein Charakterisierung diskreter Gruppen vom Typ I*, Inventiones math. **6** (1968), 190-196.

Val–89. A. Valette, *The conjecture of idempotents: a survey of the* C^**-algebraic approach*, Bull. Soc. Math. Belg. **46** (1989), 485–521.

Val–02. A. Valette, *Introduction to the Baum-Connes conjecture*, Birkhäuser, 2002.

Vin–71. Vinberg, *Discrete linear groups generated by reflections*, Math. USSR Izvestija **5** (1971), 1083–1119.

Voi–76. D. Voiculescu, *A non-commutative Weyl – von Neumann theorem*, Revue roumaine de math. pures et appl. **21** (1976), 97–113.

Yos–51. H. Yoshizawa, *Some remarks on unitary representations of the free group*, Osaka Math. J. **3** (1951), 55–63.

Zim–84. R.J. Zimmer, *Ergodic theory and semi-simple groups*, Birkhäuser, 1984.

Pierre de la Harpe, Section de Mathématiques, Université de Genève, C.P. 64, CH-1211 Genève 4, Suisse. E-mail : Pierre.delaHarpe@math.unige.ch